

Exhibit A

In re Delphi Corporation, et al., Case No. 05-44481 (RDD)

***Responses To The Debtors' Tenth Omnibus Claims Objection
Organized By Respondent¹***

	RESPONSE	PROOF OF CLAIM NOS.	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION OR PROPOSAL²	ORDER MODIFICATION (IF ANY)
1.	Furukawa Electric Co., Ltd. (Docket No. 7639)	2648	Furukawa Electric Co., Ltd ("Furukawa") asserts that on or about January 11, 2007 it filed proof of claim no. 16480 (the "Original Proof of Claim") in the amount of \$48,067.69, and on February 26, 2007 it amended the Original Proof of Claim. By this Objection, the Debtors seek to disallow and expunge proof of claim no. 2648 as duplicative of the Original Proof of Claim, leaving the Original Proof of Claim as the surviving claim. Furukawa asserts that, although the Objection states that the Debtor named on the amended proof of claim is Delphi Corporation, the claim is actually asserted against Delphi Automotive Systems LLC. Furukawa states that it responds to the objection only to avoid any implication that it has conceded that the Debtor against which the claim is asserted is Delphi Corporation.	Adjourn	

¹ This chart reflects all Responses entered on the docket as of April 19, 2007 at 12:00 p.m. (prevailing Eastern time).

² This chart reflects all resolutions or proposals as of April 19, 2007 at 12:00 p.m. (prevailing Eastern time).

	RESPONSE	PROOF OF CLAIM NOS.	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION OR PROPOSAL ²	ORDER MODIFICATION (IF ANY)
2.	ThyssenKrupp Budd Systems, LLC, ThyssenKrupp Waupaca, Inc., and ThyssenKrupp Stahl Company (Docket No. 7645)	16490, 16491	ThyssenKrupp Budd Systems, LLC, ThyssenKrupp Waupaca, Inc., and ThyssenKrupp Stahl Company (the "TK Budd Companies") assert that they filed a setoff motion in April 2006. The TK Budd Companies assert that the parties agreed to hold the setoff motion in abeyance pending analysis by the Debtors of the facts and law asserted in the motion. The TK Budd Companies assert that, because the parties agreed to hold the setoff motion in abeyance, the Objection is an improper attempt to recharacterize their claims as unsecured (the surviving claims are unsecured). The TK Budd Companies request that the court enter an order allowing claims 16490 and 16491.	Adjourn	
3.	Hyundai Motor Company (Docket No. 7651)	15587	Hyundai Motor Company ("Hyundai") asserts that the Objection should be overruled because it fails to produce evidence to overcome the prima facie validity of Hyundai's claim. Hyundai further asserts that the claim, on its face, is not duplicative of the proposed surviving claim because the supporting documentation supplied with the two claims is different.	Adjourn	
4.	Hyundai Motor America (Docket No. 7652)	15592	Hyundai Motor America ("Hyundai") asserts that the Objection should be overruled because it fails to produce evidence to overcome the prima facie validity of Hyundai's claim. Hyundai further asserts that the claim, on its face, is not duplicative of the proposed surviving claim because the supporting documentation supplied with the two claims is different.	Adjourn	

	RESPONSE	PROOF OF CLAIM NOS.	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION OR PROPOSAL ²	ORDER MODIFICATION (IF ANY)
5.	Longacre Master Fund Ltd. (Docket No. 7670)	a) 2648 b) 16266	<p>a) Proof of claim no. 2648 was transferred to Longacre Master Fund Ltd. ("Longacre") by Furukawa Electric Co. Ltd. ("Furukawa"). Furukawa had amended proof of claim no. 2648 with two claims, proofs of claim nos. 16481 and 16480 (the "Two Claims"). Longacre asserts that the Debtors seek to expunge proof of claim no. 2648 with only one of the Two Claims. Longacre states that the Debtors appear to oppose the allowance of the second of the Two Claims that amended proof of claim no. 2648. Longacre asserts that the Debtors' objection should address the Two Claims that amended proof of claim no. 2648.</p> <p>b) Proof of claim no. 16266 was initially filed by Calvary Design Team, Inc. ("Calvary") and was subsequently transferred to Longacre. Proof of claim no. 4298 asserted a claim for \$108,481.34 and was amended by proof of claim no. 16266, which asserted a claim for \$113,031.34. Longacre opposes the Objection seeking to expunge proof of claim no. 16266, leaving proof of claim no. 4298 for a lesser value as the surviving claim. Both proof of claim no. 4298 and proof of claim no. 16266 were amended by proof of claim no. 16378, which remains subject to the Ninth Omnibus Claims Objection. Longacre asserts that the allowance or disallowance of proofs of claim nos. 16266 and 4298 are not ripe for adjudication because the allowance of proof of claim no. 16378 remains unsettled.</p>	<p>a) Adjourn</p> <p>b) Adjourn</p>	

	RESPONSE	PROOF OF CLAIM NOS.	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESOLUTION OR PROPOSAL ²	ORDER MODIFICATION (IF ANY)
6.	Contrarian Funds, LLC (Docket No. 7672)	a) 2659, 3373, 14321 b) 16517 c) 16515	a) Contrarian Funds, LLC ("Contrarian") does not oppose the disallowance of proofs of claim nos. 2659, 3373, and 14321 provided that the Debtors recognize Contrarian as the legal and beneficial holder of proofs of claim nos. 16534, 16516, and 16479. b) Contrarian does not oppose the disallowance of proof of claim no. 16517 as a duplicate of proof of claim no. 349 provided that, prior to granting such relief, the Court allows proof of claim no. 349 in full against Delphi Medical. Proof of claim no. 349 was objected to on the Ninth Omnibus Claims Objection, but the Ninth Omnibus Objection Order did not adjourn the hearing on the claim or modify the claim. c) Contrarian consents to proof of claim no. 16515 being expunged as a duplicate claim of proof of claim no. 1308 provided that the Court enter an order allowing proof of claim no. 1308 in its full amount against DAS LLC.	a) Resolved b) Adjourn c) Adjourn	
7.	York International, Corp. (Docket No. 7675)	15530	York International, Corp. ("York") asserts that it filed proof of claim no. 15530 to ensure that a proof of claim was on file listing the name and address of York's counsel and to accept the amount listed on the Debtors' Schedule F. York asserts that proof of claim no. 15530 is not duplicative and should be allowed in the full amount.	Adjourn	
8.	Dennis Dashkovitz (Docket No. 7714)	10835	Mr. Dashkovitz asserts that his claim was filed in reference to a workers' compensation claim, and that only one claim was filed.	Adjourn	